

BACONIANA

VOL. XXIII. No. 90.

JULY, 1938

EDITORIAL.

WE have been pleased to hear that the April BACONIANA has been favourably received, being commended both for its improved external appearance and for the high quality of its contents. May we repeat that we shall be pleased to receive suggestions from members of the Society with the object of increasing the circulation of BACONIANA, extending its influence and maintaining a high standard of contributions to it?

The Council has arranged to circulate BACONIANA among several of the principal municipal Libraries in London and the provinces. The name of our journal will appear in the catalogue of these libraries and references to the articles in it will of course be indexed.

We hope to publish in our October issue an illustrated article by Dr. G. B. Curtis, Associate Dean of Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Dr. Curtis enjoys, we understand, a high reputation in the United States as an authority upon Elizabethan literature and particularly the Shakespeare Plays. Dr. Curtis proposes to reply to the objections raised some little time ago in BACONIANA by Mr. C. L'Estrange Ewen who, it will be remembered, disputed the reliability and indeed existence of certain deciphering by the late Mrs. Gallup.

Dr. Curtis, who is fully acquainted with Mrs. Gallup's work and methods, hopes to demonstrate that the criticism referred to was based on insufficient knowledge of the bi-literal cipher and failure to discriminate between the different founts of type. His article should be valuable and authoritative.

The Society's application for the opening of the tomb of Edmund Spenser in Westminster Abbey is still under consideration by the Dean who appears to be interested and favourably disposed.

We invite the attention of readers to two publications by the Society entitled "Shakspeare's Real Life Story" and "The Life of Francis Bacon." Both are admirable little pamphlets and present the biographical facts in each case for comparison. In this issue we print the first of twelve short propaganda notes—reasons in support of the Baconian authorship of the Shakespeare plays. Each "reason" will be reinforced by a quotation from the work of a strictly orthodox authority. This time we rely upon the well known extract from Emerson's "Representative Men." Support for Baconian "heresy" as the late J. M. Robertson called it may be discovered in the most unexpected quarters and tradition and traditional views adopted for three centuries by orthodox authorities are now being cast aside simply because they cannot be reconciled with what modern scholarship has learned about "Shakespeare." The Baconian "case" in its negative aspect—that Shakspeare of Stratford did not because he could not have written the Shakespearian Plays and Poems will soon be proved by the testimony of orthodox writers themselves and nowhere is this clearer than by the now general, though in some places grudging, admission that Shakespeare was an educated man.

"THE ESSENTIAL SHAKESPEARE."

A Commentary by BERTRAM G. THEOBALD.

THE name of Prof. Dover Wilson is sufficient guarantee that this little book will be vigorous and stimulating. The author gives freely from the stores of his wide knowledge, and where the plays are concerned his comments and criticisms are written with skill. But wherever he deals with biography pure and simple, one feels that he is skating on thin ice—and knows it. There is a suggestion of special pleading and of trying to find new ways to avoid old difficulties.

Very nearly at the beginning Dr. Wilson refers to what he calls the scientific school of Shakespearean biography. "Setting the plays and poems aside as 'impersonal' and therefore of no value whatever as evidence, they proceed to build up every scrap of external information into their structure, without realising that the significance they attach to each scrap depends upon their own implicit conception of the poet, and that the scraps can only be held together by a plentiful supply of mortar in the form of suppressed hypothesis." Giving Sir Sidney Lee's *Life* as the best-known example of this school, our author says: "Its theme is the story of the butcher boy of Stratford who made a fortune in London, and the conclusion it draws is that 'his literary attainments and successes were chiefly valued in serving the prosaic end of making a permanent provision for himself and his daughters'; which is like saying that Keats wrote the *Ode to a Nightingale* in order to have something in his stocking against a rainy day with Fanny Brawne. Such writers are dangerous because their show of objectivity and science may conceal their premises from the very elect. The image in Lee's heart was that of a typical English manufacturer who happened to deal in *Twelfth Nights* and *Lears*, instead of brass tacks."

108 "The Essential Shakespeare"

And Dr. Wilson concludes with these remarks: "In a word, the *Life* that Lee gave us was not the life of 'William Shakespeare,' the man and the poet, but the life that 'William Shakespeare,' the bust in Stratford Church, might have lived had he ever existed in flesh and blood."

So far so good. But it is when Dr. Wilson proceeds to discuss the Stratford bust that we open our eyes. He begins by saying "The Stratford bust is the only portrait of the poet which can claim any sort of authority, seeing that the Droeshout frontispiece in the First Folio is nothing but a clumsy engraving derived from it, and that all other portraits are themselves derived from either the bust or the engraving. Moreover the monument was erected at Stratford shortly after Shakespeare's death, before 1623 at any rate, and it is generally supposed that the features were modelled directly from a mask taken from Shakespeare's face, alive or dead."

Now here we protest; for, whether by inadvertence or by design, Dr. Wilson entirely ignores the fact that the present-day bust is not the original. Not only have the architectural features of the monument been altered, but the face is wholly different from that shown in the original. We deny that "it is generally supposed" that the face was modelled from a mask; but, even if this were so, it is certainly not the face of the modern bust but that of the original which most faithfully represents the man's features. For ourselves, we place no reliance on this story of modelling from the features, nor on any of the so-called death-masks, whether they hail from Darmstadt or elsewhere; no trustworthy evidence exists for such theories. But, aside from this, Dr. Wilson appears to overlook the great significance of the difference between the two busts; that whereas the original is hugging a sack, which might contain anything, the modern figure has been given a pen, and the hand rests on a cushion. Exit the countryman with his sack; enter the hypothetical author with his elegant cushion and pen.

Our author rightly dwells on the hideous qualities of the modern bust, but his comments are significant. "The stratford bust and Lee's *Life*, inspired by too much

gazing upon it, are together, I am convinced, mainly responsible for the campaign against 'the man of Stratford' and the attempts to dethrone him in favour of Lord Bacon, the Earl of Derby, the Earl of Oxford, the Earl of Rutland, or whatever coroneted pretender may be in vogue at the present moment." Then he goes on to say that "the bust is easily explained," his explanation being the very simple one that the sculptor was incompetent, that the face could not possibly be a true likeness of the poet, and that the sorrowing relatives had no choice but to "grin, like the travesty before them, and bear it!"

This strikes us as delightfully naive, but it carries no conviction. We prefer to believe that the very unpleasant original was a moderately good portrait of the actor, and that the modern alteration, though quite different, equally portrays a man who could not possibly have been the immortal bard, any more than the vapid Droeshout engraving could represent him. We cannot assume that all the sculptors and engravers were incompetent, nor even that they were directly responsible for these portraits. The very fact that these three, the most famous of all Shakespeare portraits, are all hideous and all widely different from each other, does not imply clumsiness on the part of the artists, but rather a deliberate design by some person or persons behind the scenes to emphasise the fact that the Stratford man was in truth a commonplace individual with no pretensions whatever to poetic renown.

Dr. Wilson's alternative is equally refreshing. He places as frontispiece to his book the so-called "Grafton" portrait; not because he believes or wishes us to believe it is genuine, but because the subject of the portrait is exactly contemporaneous with Shakespeare and might easily typify the kind of face the author really possessed! He says that "the reader may find it useful in trying to frame his own image of Shakespeare. It will at any rate help him to forget the Stratford bust." Well, well! Is this modern biography? To throw aside inconvenient facts and replace them by visions to stimulate the imagination? We prefer to seek a satisfying explanation of the facts.

110 "The Essential Shakespeare".

When he comes to the plays, Dr. Wilson's analysis and commentary is keen, lucid and graphically written. He considers, for example, that they do contain topical allusions and "reflect the passing intellectual and social fashions of his day," but that "Shakespeare was a dramatic artist, not a journalist, and above all he was subtle." He glanced at topical events in passing, but not openly. This was the only safe method in those times. But listen to this: "That Shakespeare was himself passionately fond of music is witnessed by the countless references to music and singing in the plays." Here is an example of constructing the biography of a writer solely from his writings; and so far as the authorship problem is concerned it begs the question. We have no idea whether the Stratford man was fond of music or not. Another example of the same kind is this: "From the very beginning he brought from Stratford a delicate nose, which found the effluvia of London, human and otherwise, highly distasteful." Did young William, then, escape from the middens and muck-heaps of Stratford only to find himself among the greasy, reeking mob of groundlings at the Globe? Or did that delicate nose belong to the finely sensitive Francis Bacon? He at least was noted for his hatred of foul smells and his love of beautiful perfumes.

In the chapter headed "Enter William Shakespeare with Divers of Worship," Dr. Wilson alludes to our almost complete lack of information about Shakspeare's early youth, and continues thus: "And then suddenly in the years 1592 to 1594 the curtain is drawn aside to discover him already at the height of fame and prosperity; as a leading actor in the leading company in England; as a member of the most brilliant of court circles, as a poet whose publications were more sought after than those of any contemporary, and as a dramatist of such acknowledged power that one of the best-known dramatists of the day is found advising his fellow-playwrights to give up trying to compete with him. Surely there is no more dramatic entry in the whole of history than this of history's greatest dramatist." To which we reply, "Surely there is no limit to the amount of conjecture which biographers

will accept in place of fact." To say that Shakspeare was "at the height of fame and prosperity" by 1594 is manifestly absurd. In 1594 nothing had appeared in print under the name Shakespeare except *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*. Every one of the plays had been anonymous, and there is no proof that as early as 1594 the Stratford man was reputed to be their author. To say that Shakspeare was "a leading actor" is pure conjecture. To say that he was "a member of the most brilliant of court circles" is barefaced invention. The dedication of *Venus and Adonis* to Southampton affords no proof of personal friendship between the rising actor and the young nobleman. Southampton never even mentions him. Why should one of the foremost peers of the realm consort with such a man? A member of brilliant court circles indeed! The notion is preposterous. As for being a dramatist of such acknowledged power that he was above competition, this is based solely on the well-known complaint of Robert Greene, which Dr. Wilson apparently accepts not only as being gospel truth but as representing the generally received opinion. Without embarking upon the well-worn topic of the "Upstart crow beautified with our feathers," suffice it to say that Greene's use of the epithet "Shake-scene" is by no means a certain identification of William Shakspeare; and even assuming it were, all that he says amounts to this: that a certain upstart was purloining dramatic work by other men and passing it off as his own; that he was an actor and probably a play-broker. Dr. Wilson likewise accepts Chettle's apology as referring to Shakspeare, whereas this is extremely doubtful. Chettle does not name Shakspeare. Upon such slender foundations as these do scholars build up their confident biographies of the actor.

Passing on, our author comes to the boyhood of young William, and calmly rules out what he calls the "assumption" derived from Halliwell-Phillipps, that Shakspeare was an ill-educated butcher boy "all but destitute of polished accomplishments, whose education stopped at thirteen and who did not leave Stratford until he was tewnty-three." He then makes wholly unjustifiable comparisons between the homes of Shakspeare and

112 "The Essential Shakespeare."

those of Marlowe, Ben Jonson, Spenser, Milton, Keats and Wordsworth. Now Marlowe is believed to have had a University education; Jonson was at Westminster School under the renowned Camden as headmaster; Spenser went to Cambridge University; Milton was at St. Paul's School, London, and likewise at Cambridge; while as for Keats and Wordsworth, educational standards in their day were entirely different. It is not the humbleness of the home which matters, but the facilities for acquiring sound education. Yet Dr. Wilson says: "It is necessary to emphasise these details (about John Shakspeare's position) in order to combat the notion that Shakespeare grew up 'with illiterate relatives and in a bookless neighbourhood,' to quote Halliwell-Phillipps once again. There is plenty of evidence to show that other mercers of Stratford were well educated and cultivated persons, and there is extant a letter in Latin written by a boy of eleven to his father, who was a friend of the Shakespeares."

All this is nothing to the point. Because a boy could write a letter in Latin it does not follow that he could write cultured English. Elementary Latin was taught at the Grammar School, but little else, according to Sir Edmund Chambers. The first English Grammar had not appeared when young William went to school—if he ever did. What matters it that John Shakspeare was High Bailiff, if both he and his wife signed their names with a mark? More significant still, William's daughter Judith could do no more. These are facts which do matter. He did grow up "with illiterate relatives."

Dr. Wilson frankly admits that there is not a tittle of evidence to prove that William went to school; and he endeavours to get over this difficulty by stating that "there were excellent alternatives to the Grammar School at that time, which would be fitter nurseries for dramatic genius and more in keeping with that passion for music which we know Shakespeare possessed." Here are more unwarrantable assumptions. There is nothing but gossip retailed by Aubrey—no shred of proof that William had any dramatic genius in his boyhood; and, as already pointed out, to say that the author "Shakespeare" had a

passion for music is no evidence that the actor Shakspeare was thus gifted.

Our author admits again that to credit the authorship of *Love's Labours Lost* to a butcher boy who left school at thirteen and whose education was only what a little provincial borough could provide "is to invite one either to believe in miracles or to disbelieve in 'the man of Stratford.' " We heartily agree. But seemingly he takes upon himself to reject the only information we possess on these matters, and prefers to conjecture that William did receive a proper education; for he says: "However this may be, it is certain that the mature Shakespeare had somehow picked up as good an education in life and the world's concerns as any man before or since. . ." Once more he begs the question of authorship. "Shakespeare" certainly had a magnificent education; but can he be identified with "the Stratford rustic," as Messrs. Garnett and Gosse term the actor? That is the problem which Dr. Wilson never attempts to solve. Yet it is the kernel of the whole matter.

Then follow more flights of fancy. "His poems and early plays are as full of Warwickshire sights and sounds as Wordsworth's poems are full of the Lake country." The poems and early plays are certainly not full of allusions to sights and sounds which are specifically of Warwickshire. (Incidentally, no play contains the sound of the word "Stratford"!) And as for characters, attempts to fasten them to Warwickshire have been by no means always successful. Dr. Wilson rightly emphasises the large part taken up in early Shakespearean comedies with "young-mannish conversation," and refers to such young men as students, courtiers, or inns-of-court men. But he does not explain how the "upstart crow" acquired an easy familiarity with the manners and speech of cultured men of that type. Apparently such details do not trouble him.

Our author states his belief that "Shakespeare's tragedies reflect personal feeling and inner spiritual experience. Some artists have been able to keep their lives and their creations in different compartments. Others, and I think most of the greatest, decidedly have

not." In this connection he remarks that from 1601 to 1608 "the conclusion is, I think, irresistible that, for whatever cause, Shakespeare was subject at this time to a dominant mood of gloom and dejection, which on one occasion at least brought him to the verge of madness." Very true; but no one has ever succeeded in tracing this gloom to the circumstances of William Shakspeare's life. All Dr. Wilson can do is to suggest that just as we are now suffering from the after effects of the Great War, "which began in a temper of exaltation, best expressed in the poetry of Rupert Brooke, ended in a holocaust of blood and mud, and was followed . . . by the cynical Peace of Versailles," so "the Elizabethan catastrophe described the same curve within a narrower ambit: national elation after the defeat of the Armada, best expressed in *Henry V*, the crash of Essex, and the squalid peace of James." We leave our readers to judge how far, if at all, this can be fitted into the life story of William Shakspeare. We leave them also to judge whether Dr. Wilson has done anything towards solving the real authorship problem.

We cannot conclude this commentary without a protest against the passages in which Dr. Wilson refers incidentally to Francis Bacon. It is bad enough when the uninstructed public talk of Bacon's "treachery" to Essex, but far worse when such erroneous views are put forward by scholars. A single quotation on this point must suffice here. In his *Life and Times of Francis Bacon*, 1878, Vol. I, Book 2, Chap. 6, pp. 360/1, James Spedding wrote: "In a note to Dr. Rawley's 'Life of Bacon' I said that I had no fault to find with him for any part of his conduct towards Essex, and that I thought many people would agree with me when they saw the case fairly stated. Closer examination has not at all altered my opinion on either point. And if I have taken no notice of what has been said on the other side, it is because I do not wish to encumber this book with answers to objections which a competent judgment would not raise." How long will it be before the slanders against Francis Bacon cease for ever?





Truth Brought
to Light by Time
or the most Remark-
able Transactions
of the first
fourteen years
of King James
Reigne.

Printed for Ric Baldwin

“TRUTH BROUGHT TO LIGHT.”

By PERCY WALTERS.

IT is seldom that a Frontispiece has no connection with the subject of the book in which it appears; but such is the case with the rare and curious volume entitled “Truth brought to light and discovered by Time, or a discourse and Historicall Narration of the first XVIII. yeares of King James Reigne. Printed by Richard Cotes, and are to be sold by Michaell Sparke (&c.) 1651. John Droeshout, Sculp. Lond.”

The Frontispiece and Title-page combined has been reproduced with Mrs. M. F. Bayley’s article in *BACONIANA*, July, 1937, No. 86, page 286. This picture is full of unexplained emblems of considerable interest.

The editor pretends to explain the meaning of these emblems in five doggerel verses, which are here given.

THE EMBLEMATICAL TITLE EXPLAINED (Edition 1692).

Triumphant *Truth* trampling on *Error* base,
With *one Hand* hidden *Secrets* doth uncase;
With *t’other* draws the *Curtain*, shews in *King James*
That *Death*, *Kings*, *Crowns*, *Scepters*, and *all things* tames;
Expressed by this *dead King’s* posture, right,
Who *dead*, all *Regal Ornaments* doth slight.

One *t’other* side *all-conquering Time* doth stand,
A watchful *Sentinel*, and with his *Hand*
Draws back the *other Curtain*, to descry,
That *Princes* must as well as *Peasants* die;
And helps *t’uncover Secrets* covered long,
And *under’s feet* tramples on *Death* most Strong.

Then, next, behold experienc’d *Memory*
The true *Recorder* of all *History*.
Spurning down black *Oblivion* with his *looks*
Whilst he turns o’re his *Parchments* and his *Books*;
And by his expert *Knowledge* calls to mind
The truth of *Stories* which thou here shalt find.

On t'other side sits *History* most grave,
Writes down what *Memory* unto him gave,
To countenance both *Time* and *Truth* most sweet,
And treads down lazy *Sloth* under his feet;
Relating here, the *Ranting* days of old,
Of whose base pranks, many *foul Tales* are told.

At last, ith'midst, thou may'st a *Coffin* spy,
Wherein a *murthered Corps* enclos'd doth lie;
On which, a *Light* and *Urn*, thou plac'd mayst see,
And in the midst to grow a *spreading Tree*,
Full fraught with *various Fruits*, most *fresh* and *fair*,
To make *succeeding Times* most *rich* and *rare*.

How the writer of this doggerel can have imagined that his explanation of the emblems would be accepted by the public is beyond conception—it is nothing but camouflage to put the ordinary reader off the scent, while the true meaning is unexplained. The initiated, or understanding reader would be able to see that the central figure represents Francis Bacon, sitting in the same contemplative attitude as in the Gorhambury monument, with the crown and sceptre at his feet; alas, never to be his. The other parts of this Title-page are evidently reminiscent of important events in his life, and have no bearing on that of King James. In the following description and remarks I have only given my own views of the real meaning of most of the emblems, and leave others to form their opinion; but I would mention that in the original picture the details are much clearer than has been possible with the reproduction in BACONIANA, No. 86. The same illustration is here shown beside that of the 1692 edition, for comparison.

The Dream of Francis Bacon.

In the top section Bacon is disclosed in old age, wearing an ermine-trimmed robe, and leaning on his elbow as in the monument, his hand resting on a skull placed on a covered table, or coffin.

At the back of the chair are three panels all very indistinct, but the one in the centre has a coat of arms, with a

crown above, and an anchor below with two supporting animals.

The right panel has a nude female figure seated on a throne, possibly representing *Venus*, the subject of Bacon's earliest poem.

On the left panel are two men (one seated) and one who appears to wear a lawyer's wig, the figure of a woman, also a seated man. I can form no opinion as to the meaning of this group.

The left section shows a large and finely engraved figure of Truth, with the rays of the sun pouring upon her, which she seems to invoke, while she pulls aside one of the curtains which had obscured the objects of Bacon's dream. Under her feet is the prostrate figure of a man grasping a crutch to indicate lameness; the face is evidently a portrait, and is, I believe, intended to represent Anthony Bacon, foster-brother of Francis and his great helper, the only picture of him which I have yet discovered and here Truth is treading him down into obscurity.

The Section on the right has a figure of Time, with wings, who is pulling aside the other Curtain; on his chest is the face of a clock, with the hours reversed (as in the “clock cipher”), one hand pointing to VI on the face of the clock, faintly seen when magnified. On the original engraving, is the picture of a building with towers, and a lake in front, somewhat resembling the old engraving of Canonbury Tower, where Bacon lived for some years, and where can still be seen the list of England's Kings, with the space marked FR.—, between Elizabeth and Jacobus—evidence that Francis was heir to the throne, and possibly crowned.

The handle of Time's scythe is pointing through a window to the sky, which shews two stars, as in Bacon's coat of arms, and a crescent moon, which appears on the boar in his crest. Time is standing on a skeleton, which has a long arrow behind it, and a quiver on the ground. This is surely intended for Shaksper, the deceased actor whom Bacon had used as a mask for his Dramas; indeed the bones of the pelvis indicate the initials W.S. (read backwards).

The lower Section on the left represents a man with a

round beard and pleated cap, seated at a table, with a scroll to which he is pointing; on the ground beneath the table he is treading down a young man who holds in his left hand a broken cross. This seems to represent the young Francis kept in subjection by the older man, who might be Burghley, discovering the MS. of a play.

The Section on the right shews a hump-backed man wearing a conical cap, also seated at a table, writing in a large book, while underneath is the recumbent figure of Bacon in middle age, leaning on his arm, and being crushed down by the feet of the seated man, who I think must be Cecil, his greatest enemy. Both these sections shew on high shelves several bound and clasped books, also scrolls.

The centre Section represents an open volume, on which appears the title of the book, and beneath it is a spreading palm tree from which hang five books and three scrolls. The whole seems to represent the tree of knowledge, the fruits of which are the works of great authors. The lighted candle and growing flower are emblems of Truth, which, having as its base a coffin representing the dead past, is ever-living and eternal.

I may mention that both copies of this book which I have seen have the Frontispiece pasted in after it was bound, and the "verses" have also been added, so that these emblems were evidently included as an after-thought.

We now come to the book itself, and the "Epistle to the Reader" is of particular interest. It is headed—

"The Stationer to the Impartial Reader,
Gentlemen, and others."

This is very curiously worded, and professes to inform the Reader concerning the origin of the information which is disclosed; but all the names are withheld, and only the initials G.W. given as that of the "Preserver."

"Time ends all and brings to light variety of strange and several actions as here is to be seen by the ensuing History. Many in these daies . . . will hardly give credit to the Truth thereof, (for Truth and Reality

hath been too much obscured), but now understand by Pain, Care, and Industry, these have been Collected and Preserved published to the world.

If thou desirest to know the Authors and Preservers of these most remarkable Accidents, and Publisher and Divulger of this excellent Narrative History please to take notice these came forth of the Studies, Closets, Cabinets, of some Secretaries of State, and some others, men of no mean quality. . . . For you will finde it had more Progenitors than one or two, and that Truth itself hath been the best Nurse, and that carefull Gentleman G.W. the worthy Preserver of these and many more Originals of such like Nature and Kinde, which have been, like to a Torch unlighted, in obscurity and darkness. In which distance of time, some have adventured to light and therefore I have lighted up the Torch to public view and to the judgment of the understanding Reader.

All this, I say being now brought upon
This World a Stage, wheron that day
A King and Subjects, part did play
And now by Death, is sin Rewarded
Which in Life time, was not Regarded;
And other here take up the Rooms,
Whilst they lye low in Graves and Tombs.

And if any Gentleman or Man of Quality shall make doubt, because in some two or three places a Name is left out, we have done according to the Originall Copy, and if they be desirous to see the Originalls, some of which be signed with the King's own hand, and other some under divers Lords, Bishops, and Examiners, they shall have leave to see them.”

“MI. SCINTILLA.”

This signature appears to be a fanciful way of veiling the name of the Stationer, or supposed seller of the book, viz., Michaell Sparke.

A large part of the work is concerned with “The proceedings touching the Divorce between Lady Frances Howard, and Robert, Earl of Essex (1613) and the fact is

mentioned that at the time of the "pretended" marriage in January, 1603, Lady Frances was only 13 years of age, and Robert, Earl of Essex, "about" 14.

The speech of Sir Francis Bacon at the Arraignment of the Earl of Somerset, for the poisoning of Sir Thomas Overbury in the Tower, is given in full; also the "Pardon of Frances Carre, late Countesse of Somerset" as being only an accessory to the crime; it is drawn out by Bacon, and given both in Latin and English.

It is here recorded that the belief was widely prevalent at the time, that the death of Prince Henry was due to poison; but the evidence of this seems not conclusive.

It seems very probable that Bacon, when in retirement, after his supposed death, caused this book to be published as a true record of events with which he had active connection over many years, taking its material from notes which he had made during his time of office, when he would have had access to very secret documents required for his purpose. Each portion of the book has its separate title page and date, the subjects being so varied in nature that it is probable it was originally intended to be issued in several separate pamphlets.

There is some significance in the fact that the "Emblem" picture was engraved by a member of the Droeshout family, one of whom produced the inane figure of Shakespeare in the First Folio. They were both probably employed by Bacon, and knew his secret.

Since writing the above description, and my interpretation of the Emblems, I have inspected at the British Museum a later edition of the work, dated 1692, and was surprised to find that the parts of the picture which I had conjectured to have Baconian indications, have been in this edition quite obliterated, while the remainder of the engraving, although entirely a new one, is nearly the same. The following alterations have been made.

- 1st. The Figure in the Chair now bears the face of a younger man, and may possibly be a fair likeness of James 1st.
- 2nd. Truth now has her foot entirely covering the face of the crouching man with the crutch.

3rd. Time's clock dial has no hand pointing to VI and no figure X, while instead of the small building with towers, there are the faces of two men.

4th. The pelvis bones of the Skeleton, with W.S. indicated, now have Time's foot placed over them, and a pole replaces the arrow.

Thus the Baconian indications have been purposely removed for obvious reasons, and this fact suggests that my conjectures as to their meaning were correct.

Another important fact is that this later edition makes no reference to an earlier one, and suppresses many parts which were in it.

The Epistle, called “The Stationer to the impartial Reader,” signed Mi. Scintilla, is entirely omitted, for the reason, I think that it might be construed as an indication that the “Preserver” of the documents, mentioned under the initials G.W., was the divulger of the secret history and his identity possibly discovered.

A new Address to the Reader is given, which is simply a short digest of James's reign, and the History concludes “So far we have followed Truth at the Heels, and Time here rest himself.” “Finis.”

SPENSER'S TOMB.

BY R. L. EAGLE.

I HAVE before me a copy of "Monumenta Westmonasteriensia," being an account of the Epitaphs, &c., on the tombs and stones in Westminster Abbey, by Henry Keepe of the Inner Temple, printed in London in 1682. It contains two notes concerning Spenser's Tomb, the first being on page 46:

"Hard by the little East door is a decayed Tomb of grey Marble, very much defaced, and nothing of the antient inscription remaining, which was in Latine, but of late there is another in English to inform you that Edmund Spenser, a most excellent Poet lies there intombed, who indeed had a sweet and luxuriant fancy, and expressed his thoughts with admirable success, as his Fairy-Queen, and other works of his sufficiently declare. . . . He died in the year 1596."

The year of his birth is not mentioned in this section, but on page 208, in that part of the book devoted to Epitaphs, the following is quoted as the wording of the inscription:

"Here lieth (expecting the second coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ) the body of Edmund Spenser, the Prince of Poets in his time, whose divine spirit needs no other witness than the works which he left behind him. He was born in London in the year 1510 and died in the year 1596."

There was apparently no monument erected for twenty years after his death, though there was a Latin epitaph which Camden quoted in "Reges Reginæ" 1600, &c. The tomb referred to by Henry Keepe is that erected in 1620 by Nicholas Stone at the expense of Anne, Countess of Dorset. It was restored by private subscription in 1778. It is certainly extraordinary that the grey marble of the original

should have decayed by 1682 (a mere sixty years) and "nothing of the inscription remaining." Possibly it was a slab of slate on the floor, as this would account for the worn condition and obliteration of the inscription. The account given by Keepe shows that both the worn original and a new English inscription were present.

The edition of Spenser's Works, published in 1679, contains an engraving of the monument. On a tablet at the foot of the monument are the words, "Such is the Tombe the Noble Essex gave great Spenser's learned Reliques, &c." The statement is incorrect as Essex merely paid for the funeral and the monument was not erected until nearly twenty years after the death of Essex. The inscription shown in the 1679 Folio does not agree with that quoted by Keepe in 1682, but the latter is the more reliable and he claims to have taken "the greatest pains imaginable" in collecting his data, and states that he was not content to rely on Camden, Stowe and Weaver. Incidentally, he doubts whether Camden was the author of "*Reges Reginae*," which had three editions—1600, 1603 and 1606. The inscription in the 1679 Folio of Spenser reads:

Heare lyes (expecting the Second
comminge of our Saviour Christ
Iesus) the body of Edmond Spenser
the Prince of Poets in his tyme
whose Divine Spirit needs noe
othir witnes then the works
which he left behind him
He was borne in London
in the yeare 1510 and
died in the yeare
1596

On the present-day monument the word "Spirit" becomes "Spirrit" and "behind" now reads "behinde." The important alteration is in the dates of his birth and death to read 1553 and 1598. Modern research shows that Spenser was in Ireland up to at least the 9th December, 1598. It appears that he died, shortly after his return to England on 16th January, 1598-9. This is confirmed by

Camden who, writing in Latin in his *Annals of Queen Elizabeth's reign*, says that Spenser "had scarcely secured the means of retirement and leisure to write when he was ejected by the rebels, spoiled of his goods and returned to England in poverty, where he died immediately afterwards and was interred at Westminster near to Chaucer, his hearse being attended by poets and mournful elegies, with the pens that wrote them, being thrown into the grave." Commenting on Camden's recording of the funeral Mr. E. G. Harman in "Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Francis Bacon" observes that "Spenser's supposed friendship with Essex is most improbable, and the story therefore that the Earl paid for the funeral is a very curious one. But if true, it is intelligible under my view of the authorship of the poems, because the action of Essex covered up Francis Bacon's secret. Whether he knew it or not is immaterial, for he was always ready to do anything to help Francis Bacon, for whom he entertained feelings of warm regard and admiration. . . . I think it probable that he paid for Spenser's funeral because he was asked to do so, and that the people of his household, among whom were Anthony Bacon and his servants, managed the rest." I am not in a position to express an opinion on this point of view, but it must be remembered that Spenser had spent most of his life in Ireland since 1580, when Essex was only thirteen years old. The natural conclusion is that Essex knew little or nothing of Spenser personally, nor can it be shown that Essex was particularly interested in poets or poetry.

A PLEA FOR MODERATION.

By HOWARD BRIDGEWATER.

THE scant consideration given to the Baconian theory both by the public and the Press is, I am convinced, due largely to the fact that the Bacon Society lends its tacit or implied support to assertions by individual members which are often extravagant and sometimes absurd. This tends to alienate interest in the Society by rendering it easy for our opponent to make its claims and objects appear ridiculous.

Any Society designed, as ours is, to propagate an unorthodox theory, which is, in itself, a challenge to public opinion, should—while courting discovery of any new facts calculated to strengthen its case—avoid overt support for theories which its own members regard as highly controversial.

Pending further evidence than we have at present, I would suggest that we discourage reference to the idea that Francis Bacon was not born the son (as history asserts he was) of Lady Anne and Sir Nicholas. Even though this could be established, it would be of no advantage to us. Lady Anne Bacon was the daughter of the learned Sir Anthony Cooke, who was tutor to Edward VI. She was one of the most brilliantly educated ladies of her time, while Sir Nicholas was one of the astutest noblemen at Court; and the genius of their son is not better explained if he be fathered upon the Earl of Leicester, as the result of an illicit intercourse, or secret marriage, with Queen Elizabeth.

In common with many Baconians I incline to the opinion that Bacon may have been the author of the (anonymous) *Leycester's Commonwealth*, which was found, together with various transcripts of Bacon's work, in the collection we now know as the "Northumberland Manuscript."

But whoever wrote *Leycester's Commonwealth*, the author denounces Leicester as an arch traitor, and as being of all

men the greatest danger to the realm, and there is rather more than a suspicion that he was responsible for the death of his Wife Amy Robsart.

It would appear, then, that the fame of Francis Bacon would be no fairer if Leicester was his father. Belief that he was seems to rest upon evidence that was always suspect and which has recently been proved by Mr. L'Estrange Ewen to be entirely unreliable: that of the Biliteral Cipher so called. Confidence cannot be asked for deciphering that which produces two different stories from the same original! Francis Bacon was the founder of inductive philosophy, which makes well-ascertained facts the basis of truth: not merely one or two circumstances that may seem suspicious.

We may not have a high opinion of Burleigh; but had the Queen been married, that fact must surely have been known to him; and knowing it, he could have hardly urged her to marry the Duke d'Alencon, Leicester being still alive.

The main object of the Bacon Society is to bring the public of this country to recognition of the fact that it is to Francis Bacon, the greatest genius of the Elizabethan age, that we owe the greatest literature of all time; and I maintain that we only weaken its case and prejudice his claims by associating them with speculations, too often offered in the guise of facts.

I now come to the theory that Francis Bacon was not only a Freemason but was the founder of modern freemasonry. And about that I would say this: that, while in no way advancing our main object, Bacon's association with Freemasons would if proved be an interesting addition to our knowledge of the activity of that great man. I should, therefore, welcome the appearance of any soberly written treatise bringing forward such evidence as may exist. But the theory—and it is no more—is permeating our literature, and becoming an article of faith. In its latest form it is declared in a pamphlet written by Mr. Alfred Dodd, entitled "A Leaflet of Interest to Freemasons in Particular and Litterateurs in General."

No one who has listened to Mr. Dodd can fail to be

impressed (even if in complete disagreement with him) by his insight into, and appreciation of, the literary and philosophical value of "Shakespeare." What a pity, then, that he should have endeavoured to demonstrate as a fact that Bacon was the founder of freemasonry by arguments such as those advanced in the pamphlet referred to: I must give an example of his method. He takes from *The Tempest* his main text, and in Act V from a speech of Alonso quotes this—

And there is in this business more than Nature
Was ever conduct of: some oracle
Must rectify our knowledge.

descanting upon it as follows: "In a Freemason's Lodge the oracle that speaks with authority is a Worshipful Master. Since the author wishes the discerning reader to know the kind of oracle he has in mind, he writes the words so that the first letters of the three lines spell A. W. M. All Masons know that A. W. M. is the abbreviated Ritual Code for "A Worshipful Master." So, you see, in future every time you notice that the initial letters of any speech in "Shakespeare" happen to run in sequence A. W. M. you are to say to yourself "Ah! that means that the author is again informing you that he was a worshipful master! Moreover, as Mr. Dodd goes on to demonstrate, you are entitled to come to the same conclusion even if these initial letters read the other way round as M. W. A. You can, by transposing them in your mind (by mentally standing as it were, on your head) get them in the desired order.

The beautiful passage above quoted actually begins with the lines "this is as strange a maze as e'r men trod;" and I should have thought that had the author really wanted to embody a message of any kind therein he would have commenced his task with the first line; but as that line happens to begin with the letter "T" and the letter "T" is of no particular use to Mr. Dodd, he ignores it. Then again I fail to see that, because Alonso says "some oracle must rectify our knowledge," it follows at all that the author had any particular oracle in mind; still less had any desire that the "discerning reader," any

more than Alonso, should bother himself to think out which of the oracles was thus casually referred to. And I have never heard any worshipful Master referred to as an oracle. Moreover, with all deference to Mr. Dodd, A.W.M. is *not* the abbreviated ritual code for Worshipful Master. W.M. alone is the ritual abbreviation, for there is only one W.M. at a Lodge meeting and consequently no occasion at all for the initials A.W.M. In addition to all this we are asked to believe that these beautiful lines were written under the handicap, in the author's mind, that the initial letters of three of the four lines must be A.W.M.

I regret that lack of space prevents me from dealing more exhaustively with this pamphlet; I can only say that in subsequent pages Mr. Dodd allows still greater rein to his amazing imagination. In a recent issue of *BACONIANA* Mr. W. A. Vaughan confirms the experience of others in a letter in which he writes that "Personal enquiries of my masonic friends, who are pastmasters in the history of Freemasonry, elicit the substantial replies that the Craft has no knowledge that Francis Bacon was a mason, and that masonic tradition is silent concerning him as the introducer or founder of any Lodge."

Now to another matter. The great Verulam, having died, and his death having been attested by every kind of evidence which the circumstances might be expected to have provided, one would have thought that he might have been allowed to rest in peace. But a section of the Bacon Society declines even to accept the historical evidence of his death and burial. And why not? Because many years ago a certain lady, who strongly influenced both by her written work and personality the early members of the Society, became obsessed to such an extent that she would believe no accepted fact about Francis Bacon whatever. Accordingly she expressed disbelief of the facts relative to his death, without apparently giving a thought to the question what possible purpose could be served by substituting for history a tale told with the object of enshrouding the time and manner of his death in mystery and providing him with an unknown Tomb and a

doubtful apotheosis. Our former President Mr. C. C. Bompas, M.A. (a distinguished lawyer), contributed an article to *BACONIANA*, in which he demonstrated that the facts of Bacon's death were attested by Mr. Hobbes, one of his most intimate friends, by Dr. Rawley, his Chaplain, and by Sir Thos. Meautys, his Secretary. In addition there was, and is, Bacon's own beautiful letter to the Earl of Arundel, explaining how he was forced to take up lodging at his house, "where your housekeeper is very careful and diligent about me, which I assure myself your lordship will not only pardon towards him, but think the better of him for it;" which letter concludes with his apology for the fact that he is unable to write with his own hand "but in troath my fingers are so disjoynted with this fit of sickness, that I cannot steadily hold a pen."

Referring to an "inquisitio post mortem" that was held in 1634 to determine some right of inheritance, and having quoted the findings, Mr. Bompas comments upon it "We have here the oaths of sixteen trustworthy and lawful men of the County of Hertford confirming the statement of Dr. Rawley, Sir Th. Meautys, Sir Henry Wootton, Mr. Hobbes, Sir Benjamin Rudyerd, and Sir Robt. Rich that Francis Bacon died on 9th April 1626, and explaining the devolution of his property upon and since his death, and he reminds us that his widow married again shortly after his death: of which happening she must have been well assured.

And Mr. Bompas adds the very significant comment; that the date of Bacon's death can scarcely be displaced by the suggestion, unsupported by evidence, that a Rosicrucian Father lived to the age of 106, and a conjecture that he might have been Francis Bacon.

Finally I would remind you that Bacon's own motto was *mediocria firma*!

THE LIFE OF FRANCIS BACON.

FRANCIS BACON was born in London in 1561. He was baptised on 25th January as son of Sir Nicholas and Lady Bacon. His father was Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England and his mother was one of the most accomplished women of her time. As a child he showed unusual promise and attracted the attention of Queen Elizabeth, who called him her "Young Lord Keeper."

In April, 1573, at the age of 12, he entered Cambridge University: his tutor there was Whitgift, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, by whom licence to publish *Venus and Adonis* was granted in 1593. At Christmas, 1575, Francis left Cambridge, having acquired all the knowledge that University was able to impart, particularly that wide knowledge of the classics conspicuously displayed even in the earliest Shakespeare plays. In 1576, at the age of 15, he entered as a student at Gray's Inn. Other members of that learned Society were the Earl of Southampton (to whom *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece* were dedicated), Francis Bacon's uncle, Lord Burleigh (who is said to have been the original "Polonius"), Lord Strange (in whose company the actor Shakspeare played) and William Herbert Earl of Pembroke (one of Mary Fitton's lovers, to whom many believe the Shakespeare Sonnets were addressed and to whom the First Folio of the Shakespeare Plays was dedicated). In September 1576, Bacon went with Sir Amyas Paulett the English Ambassador, to Paris, remaining in France for over two years, gaining a colloquial knowledge of French and acquainting himself with the life of the French Court. He visited many parts of France, among them the battle-fields famous in the Shakespeare chronicle plays. He also visited Italy and Spain.

In 1579 Sir Nicholas Bacon died and Francis returned to his home at Gorhambury, near St. Albans, where severa₁

scenes in the early play, *Henry VI*, are laid. He studied law, being called to the Bar in 1582. He remained a briefless barrister for some considerable time, and we find him writing "the Bar will be my bier." He applied to Lord Burleigh to exert influence on his behalf, but with little success, except that in 1584 he was returned to the House of Commons as member for Melcombe. He seems to have led the life partly of a courtier and partly of a recluse, and we hear little of him until 1587, when he was associated with other gentlemen of Gray's Inn in presenting certain masques and devices at Greenwich and a play called *The Misfortunes of Arthur*. But the years 1588 to 1591 brought him nothing but disappointment. Weary of begging favours from Court and Queen, he thinks of becoming "some sorry bookmaker." "The contemplative planet," he writes, "carries me away." He presents the Queen with a Sonnet, he writes her "A Letter of Advice" and there is little other trace of him. The Shakespeare comedies of the period exhibit his brother Anthony's correspondence from France and Italy and Francis' own legal studies.

In 1592 Anthony returned to England and the two brothers became unpaid secretaries to the Earl of Essex, but this powerful patronage brought them no favour, and their narrow means involved Francis in many difficulties. How he filled his empty purse is not known, unless, as a man born for literature (as he described himself), he engaged in an occupation lucrative, if derogatory and disgraceful at the time—that of writing plays for the public stages. Both he and his brother loved the Drama. To Francis it was history made visible: the World itself was a Theatre: play-acting, though esteemed a toy, was a musician's bow by which the minds of men might be played upon: although of ill-repute as a profession, as a part of the education of youth it was of excellent use. In 1593 he composed the *Conference of Pleasure* and other masques: plays were performed at Anthony's house near the "Bull Inn," Bishopsgate. On the outside of the MS. of the *Conference of Pleasure* there is a list of speeches, orations and letters, and the titles of *Richard II*, *Richard III*, and

other contemporary plays. The names of Bacon and Shakespeare on this sheet are written in close proximity. A notebook of Bacon's own (the page is dated 5th December, 1594) contains several striking phrases which appear in *Romeo and Juliet*, published soon afterwards, and there are many other entries repeated in or alluded to in the Shakespeare plays. Plays were marketable; politics and philosophy were not; and Bacon describes himself as poor and working for bread. In 1594 he was responsible for the *Device of an Indian Prince*, reminiscent in some respects of the *Midsummer Night's Dream*. The following years were years of financial crisis. We find him borrowing money and being arrested for debt: he had sought help from Sympson, a hard Jew, from whose hands he was delivered by Anthony, who mortgaged property of his own to save his brother from the clutches of the usurer. In 1596 he published his treatise on *The Colours of Good and Evil* and the following year the first edition of his *Essays* saw the light.

The Queen took great offence at the performance of *Richard II*, which was published in 1598, and Bacon pacified her by the assurance that the author was not a traitor, but only a thief from Tacitus. It was probably in consequence of this that in the same year the name Shakespeare appeared for the first time upon the title-pages of the plays: hitherto all these had been published anonymously.

In 1601 began a period of even greater trouble for Francis Bacon: the rebellion of Essex was followed by the execution of the Earl. As Crown Counsel, Bacon had to take part in the prosecution of his friend for treason, and he incurred a certain amount of odium in consequence, owing to the popularity of Essex. Any blame, however, must attach, not to Bacon personally, but to the Government which decided to take advantage of his loyalty to the Queen. In the same year his brother died; and his mother became gradually insane. She died ten years later. Illness, melancholy, "doubt of present perils," "superstition" haunt him; and, as might be expected, the course of his life is reflected in the "Dark Period" of the Shakespeare

Plays. In 1611 we hear of him with Pembroke, Southampton and Montgomery as a member of the company which sent out a fleet to colonize Virginia. The ship was wrecked on the "still vexed Bermoothes." To a thrilling contemporary account of this are some of the incidents in *The Tempest* attributed.

This can be no more than the merest sketch of his life, and the story of his legal and political career cannot be told. Under James I he rose to the highest offices in the State, to fall from the position of Lord Chancellor in 1621 as a result of the malice of his enemies, the corruption of his servants, and to carelessness rather than misconduct on his own part. The story of his betrayal and fall is told in *Timon of Athens* and *King Henry VIII*. He spent the rest of his life in completing and translating his great philosophical works: the *Life of Henry VII* was written, completing the cycle of the Shakespeare chronicle plays: the *Essays* were revised.

He died on 9th April, 1626, and the lamentation poured out reads like tribute to one more than mortal. That of the Universities is to his pre-eminence as a poet-philosopher: he was the Morning Star of the Muses, the Glory of the Muses' choir, a teller of tales that amazed the Courts of Kings. The expressions of love and admiration for him personally are even more remarkable. All great and good men loved him. He was a friend unalterable to his friends: a man most sweet in his conversation and ways. Despite all the arts and malice of his enemies, he was forever to be admired, honoured, loved and lamented. He belongs to the ages and his message to this time is that which he gave his own. Men should study to be perfect in becoming again as little children: condescend to take the alphabet into their hands and, sparing no pains to search and unravel the interpretation thereof, pursue it strenuously, persevering even unto death.

‘SHAKESPEARE REDISCOVERED’

SHAKSPERE has been rediscovered by Madame Longworth de Chambrun, Doctor of the University of Paris.

The portrait and its background are dark and sinister: the stake, the gallows, the hangman's rope, and the headsman's axe, the torments of religious persecution, not only moved Shakspeare himself to shed "the drops engendered by sacred pity," but haunt him in visions of violence and set his tragic stages with scenes of thunder and of blood.

The reason was that William Shakspeare was a Catholic and, like two-thirds of Queen Elizabeth's subjects, an outlaw by reason of the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. In the light of this fact the story of his life must be read. His father and mother were Catholics and for *that* reason, and not because he was in poverty and debt as other authorities indicate, did Master Shakspeare senior absent himself from meetings of the Council. A great part of the book is devoted to an account of the tribulations and trials of the Park Hall Ardens, John Somerville, Joyce Hill, and many, many others; and in it we lose all trace of our hero, for needless to say there is no evidence whatever that he was associated with what for Madame de Chambrun was a noble army of martyrs. He re-appears, however, in her account of his marriage mystery. This was celebrated according to the Roman rite and there is little doubt, we are assured, that Hall, a priest in hiding, officiated in secret at a cost to the bridegroom of £40, notwithstanding the latter was only nineteen at the time and the fortunes of his family had been growing ever darker and darker. However the marriage proved a very happy one: the bride's dower was £6 13s. 8d., so that it appears to have been a real love match—a youthful idyll set in the rose-embower'd charm of the lovers' dwelling and pastoral surroundings. Thus, in the fancy of the gifted authoress, is the hut in

Henley Street transformed; to this change are subject the midden, the dung heap, and the squalor of the Stratford Fact.

The tributes of Jonson and Chettle are ante-dated in order to describe the bridegroom's physical attraction to his rather older rural sweetheart. We pass from an account of John Shakspeare's spiritual testament—Madame has no doubt this is genuine: one like it has been discovered in Mexico city in Spanish, which confirms for her the authenticity of the Stratford text—to that of an aunt of William's who was a nun, Domina Shakspeare and who, although she died when he was but fourteen years old, taught the child genius his mother tongue—Simon Hunt completed that great work. That we cannot identify Simon Hunt does not trouble Madame de Chambrun. Most writers call him Thomas, some George. He is thought to have been the master at the school Shakspeare is thought to have attended. And then we have the poaching incident in which, with other young bloods, he took part. Sir Thomas Lucy, charged with the duty of enquiring into the loyalty of Warwickshire people to the Queen and their attitude to the papist claims to dethrone her in favour of Mary of Scotland, accused John Shakspeare of recusancy and William fled to London lest he should share the same fate. What saved his father from the long arm of Lucy we are left to imagine.

William, after the ostler servitor period, enters a printer's establishment, perhaps does some “legal scrivening” (thus earning the term of “noverint”), asks for and obtains leave to print *Venus and Adonis* from Whitgift, Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury and tutor to Francis Bacon at Cambridge. He enters the path to success, smoothed by the third Earl of Southampton, the importance of whose interest in Shakspeare's career it is impossible to exaggerate. Through him the poet freed his father from debt and persecution: to him William himself owed the appearance of *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*. He inspired *Love's Labours Lost* and *All's Well*. The poet's verse bristles with legal terms. Southampton is reading law. Southampton (“Harry” to Madame de Chambrun) revels

136 "Shakespeare Rediscovered"

with Florio in Italian tales and translates Montaigne. Shakspeare "throws" these into his pages, and for Southampton's sake applies for the grant of a coat-of-arms in order to lessen the difference in social scale between himself and his patron.

And there the story of the re-discovered Shakspeare ends. No new light is thrown upon the Stratford retirement. The "records, secret reports and private correspondence" are silent about that. Perhaps a few words will not be out of place in reference to these new and exciting ideas, which, as Dr. G. B. Harrison in the Preface tells us, the book brings together.

There is little to support, as Sir E. K. Chambers has pointed out, its main contention that John Shakspeare was a Catholic recusant. The recusancy returns of 1592 had nothing to do with the anti-Puritan legislation of 1593. There is nothing to show that the spiritual testament was that of John Shakspeare. If it is not a forgery, it probably dates from his early life and is little evidence of his religious persuasion under Elizabeth.

The reference incidentally to the rosy, merry-cheeked John and his son Will by the "poet Mennis" is misquoted and its effect seriously misrepresented. The touching account given of the shepherd's confidence in Master Shakspeare's wife is also a misrepresentation of the fact that she borrowed from her father's shepherd and, the debt remaining unpaid by her wealthy husband at the time of his death, it was bequeathed by the shepherd to the poor of Stratford. The mis-statements of fact, prejudices and special pleading of one who before entering the literary arena swore, as she herself tells us, very solemnly never to suppress or distort evidence, deserve for this reason, if for no other, regretful comment.

The whole fabric of the authoress' vision collapses unless she can show that it was indeed the religious affiliation of Shakspeare's relatives and of his patron that determined much of his thought and action, his hasty and secret marriage, his flight and close association in London with the Essex faction.

Now William may have died a papist. The sole auth-

ority is, however, a record late in the seventeenth century for which perhaps the Rev. Richard Davies, Rector of Sapperton, is responsible; but there is a strong contrary indication in the fact that he stood as sponsor to William Walker, whom he mentions in his Will as his godson and who was baptized at Stratford in 1608. Shakspeare was buried in the chancel of the Stratford Parish Church, which again is hardly consistent with his membership of the Roman Catholic Church.

But whether William Shakspeare was Roman Catholic or not, the author of the plays and poems was certainly not, and we shall make no apology if we express our complete disagreement with Madame de Chambrun's theory in this respect. It is quite incredible that the writer of *King John*, a tragedy, part of the theme of which is resistance to the claims to temporal power of that Church and in which the quarrel between King and Pope is antedated six years, could have written, if a Catholic, of the Holy Father as “an Italian Priest,” “an usurped authority” and “a meddling priest;” of excommunication as “a curse that money might buy out;” of the Church itself “as selling a man's pardon,” as “juggling witchcraft” and as “cherishing revenue corruptly gained.”

The play of *Henry VIII* is to a great extent an apotheosis of Cranmer in Roman Catholic eyes, an arch-heretic condemned by a Roman Catholic Queen to the fire as such; and here again there is nothing in the plot of the play requiring the scene in which the King describes Cranmer as a “good and honest man,” and there is no authority in Fox's Book of Martyrs, which the drama almost literally follows elsewhere, for the King's eulogy. It is interpolated by the dramatist.

We believe that, like Bacon, the Shakespeare of the plays was opposed to the Papal Supremacy: that again like Bacon he believed that in the reign of Elizabeth “This part of the island never had 45 years of better times. For if there be considered of the one side the truth of religion established, the constant peace and security, the good administration of justice, etc.” Thus Bacon in the “Advancement of Learning,” Book I.

138 "Shakespeare Rediscovered"

And Shakespeare

"In her days every man shall eat in safety
Under his own vine what he plants: and sing
The merry songs of peace to all his neighbours
God shall be truly known."

No Catholic recusant would have written of the Great Queen thus.

We must return to the Stratford Shakspeare and to Madame de Chambrun.

There is no evidence of course that William Shakspeare was ever associated with the Earl of Southampton. The fact that to the early editions of *Venus and Adonis* a dedication was signed "William Shakespeare" is of no assistance in the well-nigh impossible task that faces us when we endeavour to associate in friendship or even in casual acquaintance two men so widely different in every qualification that makes for intimacy as were the Stratford peasant player and one of the most brilliant figures of a magnificent Court. We can only express regret that Madame de Chambrun did not abandon so unpromising a line of research and direct her attention to that life-long intimacy and early and very close relationship between Francis Bacon and Southampton which presents so much less difficulty to the unprejudiced enquirer. Bacon's correspondence with Southampton and Essex has been preserved and is of course well known. There is no Shakespeare-Southampton correspondence at all.

The second section of Madame de Chambrun's book deals almost entirely with Shakespeare's "London patron" as she calls Southampton and his associates: she even suggests that Shakespeare was easily by way of learning all that he needed for his play *Love's Labours Lost* because Sir Charles and Sir Henry Danvers corresponded with Southampton while serving the French King Henry IV! She accepts, of course, the theory that the sonnet sequence was addressed to Southampton while the actor was travelling on horseback upon a beast that "bore him tired with woe which plodded dully on as if the wretch did know his rider loved not speed." It would be difficult to regard this chapter as anything but the wildest flight of imagina-

tion of all, were it not for what follows. Mistress Fitton is stated to be of the popular blonde complexion and a notorious spinster. Mary Fitton was married twice. Madame de Chambrun states that we have a firm base of serious and often repeated testimony in favour of Shakespeare's liaison with Mistress Davenant, the Oxford hostess, by whom he had a child William. It was with this Dame pint-pot that Southampton deceived his friend!

Oscar Wilde did not identify in his story “The Portrait of Mr. W.H.” Willie Hughes as the rich and powerful patron to whom Shakespeare owed his first success. Has Madame read the fantasy in which Wilde suggested that Willie Hughes was the boy actor to whom the principal feminine parts in the Shakespearian plays were entrusted? She identifies “Mr. W.H.” as Mr. William Hervey, but upon grounds which are only a little less inadequate than the extraordinary statement that Shakespeare got into trouble over *Richard II*, which caused his absence from England from March 1601 to December 1602. These years as a matter of fact saw the death of his father and the purchase by William Shakspeare himself of more real estate at Stratford. If he were a fugitive, surely the Government would have enforced a fine upon the wealthy traitor by seizure of what must have been valuable plunder in his native village, and his pocket would have suffered as we are told so many of his fellow martyrs did.

At the Court of King James, however, he found inspiration for *Macbeth* in which play there is a reference to Shakspeare's journey to Scotland, and some of his protector's characteristic traits are reflected in *Measure for Measure*. The authoress' memory has however failed her in that she quotes “man as dressed in a little brief authority” as from *Hamlet*, a fact which unfortunately discounts other statements. There is no evidence that Shakespeare walked in solemn procession from Somerset House to Whitehall, nor that he and his fellows carried the royal dais. If William Shakspeare were the author of Sonnet 125, he would not, we think, have considered the bearing of canopy in the circumstances an honour.

Too often the authoress begins with theory which

140 "Shakespeare Rediscovered"

later appears as fact. An example of this is the statement that Fulbrook Park on page 216 had been shown to have been William's happy hunting ground on page 84 where the tell tale "maybe" is used.

Of the interpretation of the *Phoenix and the Turtle* we think that the less said the better.

We may perhaps quote in support of this view the concluding sentence of the Chapter devoted to this mysterious poem, wherein Madame de Chambrun writes, apparently quite seriously, that if there was one printer in the world qualified to know a poem of William Shakespeare's when he saw it that man was Richard Field, the Stratford tanner's son.

The handwriting of William Shakespeare is also re-discovered in a copy of the second Edition of Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles* which, with some temerity, Madame de Chambrun claims to have belonged to the Great Dramatist himself and to have been marked and underscored by him as the source of his historical plays. There appear to be several specimens of different handwriting upon this priceless treasure: in one there is the celebrated veterinary recipe "Black soape, pigge meale, and honny mingled together, good for a horse's leg swollen." This recalls pertinently the country lad's first employment at the capital. In another, by a curious irony, there appear, as the late Mr. H. Seymour pointed out in *BACONIANA* (June 1936) written hall marks associated with books and MSS belonging to Francis Bacon; and this trenchant article disposed we think finally of Madame de Chambrun's claims for these signatures which resemble Shakspeare's (we are not told which of the five different ones) and are undoubtedly of his period.

The evidence adduced in support of her contentions would not impress the most credulous of juries. Passages occurring in Chronicle and Play are underscored in the former. The initials W.S. as ornamental monograms occur six times. The book can be traced to a first owner who lived in the region of Shakspeare's home (near Rugby) and through Harriet, wife of Sir Grey Skipwith, and Sir Paton Skipwith back to Stratford and to Captain William

Jaggard. A large amount of ink has been allowed to drip by the poet when leaning over the volume. The pages recording the story of the reigns he dramatised are worn thin by thumbing; and finally, the ink and handwriting of the markings have been declared by British Museum experts as prior to 1620. Upon this evidence we are assured that we are richer by the possession of nearly a hundred words from Shakespeare's pen.

And this we are asked by Dr. G. B. Harrison, it is true with a rather disarming candour, to believe the most interesting of the less important suggestions made by Madame de Chambrun. He wishes us to believe this literary evidence convincing, and commends it to us in terms even more picturesque than those of the authoress herself. The original reader (i.e., William Shakspeare) turned pages by using a licked finger: the most striking passages which Shakespeare himself used are often spotted and stained with ink (or beer) while the pages relating the story he did not dramatise are notably clean. We regret to disagree with Dr. Harrison's puff that there is enough here to set research workers busy for the next twenty years in new directions.

The value of the chapter on the Northumberland Manuscript may perhaps be estimated by that of the statements made on page 278, that Mr. Spedding analysed it in 1860 with a view to proof that Francis Bacon was the real author of Shakespeare's work, and (on page 279) that we owe the re-discovery of the document to such partisans of the Baconian theory as Mr. James Spedding and Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence. Mr. Spedding was not a Baconian and Sir E. Durning-Lawrence had nothing whatever to do with the discovery of the Northumberland MS.

In conclusion we can only express the wish that greater care had been taken in a work of this nature (especially in view of the claims made on its behalf) to verify matters stated as of fact. We do not refer to such errors as that “the wife had her legal third in all real and literary (sic) estate” nor even to what we think a distorted and entirely misleading account of the attitude of Elizabeth and her Government to the English Catholics, but to flights of

fancy of which Hollywood alone seems worthy—Queen Henrietta Maria high in hope before the Battle of Edge Hill sleeping at New Place in the best or state bed, a component part of the guest chamber; the comparison of Ann Shakspeare's love for the second-best bed with Desdemona's attachment to her wedding sheets; the change by Shakespeare of the name Hamnet to Hamlett Sadler in his bequest of £1 8s. 8d. to buy a ring; the "sweeping" bestowal of the sword upon Thomas Combe by a testator holding a trembling pen.

We have said enough: we ought perhaps to have extended to *Shakespeare Re-discovered* and to his discoverer the charity of our silence, or contented ourselves with the suggestion that the authoress should re-name her book, publishing it as an historical romance, the scenario of which we have no doubt would pass with favour in those palaces among the celluloid nitwits where fiction and fantasy are accepted without question as fact. This we should have done, had it not been that the book has been published apparently with the commendation and approval of an authority of such eminence in the orthodox ranks as Dr. Harrison, and at the price of 12s. 6d. by so respectable a firm of publishers as Messrs. Scribner & Sons, Ltd., in America and this country. These considerations and the wide advertisement the book has received have induced us to devote space to it even at the cost of rescuing it from the oblivion into which it would, we think, have quickly fallen if it had seen the light unheralded and unpuffed.

BACON WROTE THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS.

Reason I.

The plays correspond with what we know of the life of Francis Bacon but they do not correspond with anything that we know of the life of William Shakspeare of Stratford.

Biographies of Shakespeare are mostly founded on the assumption that Shakspeare of Stratford was the author and they consist largely of conjecture, surmise, and pure imagination. "Almost all the received stuff of his life," wrote Professor Saintsbury, "is shreds and patches of tradition if not positive dream work."

The incidents in the life of the person responsible for the plays would influence the speech of the characters and other characteristics of the plays themselves. Nothing but confusion and complexity can come from a system which makes a gulf between the man and his works only to be overcome by superhuman inspiration. (*Shakespearean Truth and Tradition*, John S. Smart, M.A., D.Litt.)

Not only the learning but also the errors of the plays are identical with those of Bacon's works and more than a thousand parallels of thought and expression of Bacon and "Shakespeare" have been collected.

The little we know of Shakspeare's life seems to indicate that he was a jovial actor and manager. Emerson wrote that he could not marry this fact to Shakespeare's verse. Other men have led lives in some sort of keeping with their thought, but Shakespeare in wide contrast. Had he been less, had he reached only the common measure of great authors, we might leave the fact in the twilight of human fate, but that this Man of men. . should not be wise for himself—it must even go into the world's history that the best poet led an obscure and profane life.

BOOK REVIEWS.

SHAKESPEARE'S LAST PLAYS. By E. M. W. Tillyard, Litt.D., Chatto and Windus, price 3s. 6d.

Although dealing incidentally with *Anthony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*, Dr. Tillyard's chief theme centres round *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*. He considers that these three are connected, and in a different manner from any three earlier comedies or tragedies. "He fumbled in *Cymbeline*, did better in *The Winter's Tale*, and only in his third attempt achieved full success." In contradistinction to Lytton Strachey's view that Shakespeare had become bored with his art and with life in general, Dr. Tillyard agrees with Middleton Murry that this is not so; and further, that "the 'feigned history' he chose to draw on was taken quite as seriously by his contemporaries as the true history he abandoned." In this connection Dr. Tillyard emphasises the great importance of Sidney's *Arcadia* as an influence of the period, since it combined delight with instruction.

Dr. Tillyard postulates tragedy as implying some kind of final reconciliation or regeneration, and not as the impotent strivings of man against inexorable destiny, which was the ancient Greek conception. "The first part of my argument is, that one of Shakespeare's main concerns in his last plays, whether deliberately taken up or fortuitously drifted into, was to develop the final phase of the tragic pattern, to add, as it were, his *Eumenides* to the already completed *Agamemnon* and *Choephoroe*, a process repeated by Milton when he supplemented *Paradise Lost* with *Samson Agonistes*." And again he says: "Examining the bare plots rather than the total impression of the last three plays, we find in each the same general scheme of prosperity, destruction, and re-creation. The main character is a King. At the beginning he is in prosperity. He then does an evil or misguided deed. Great suffering follows, but during this suffering or at its height the seeds of something new to issue from it are germinating, usually in secret. In the end this new element assimilates and transforms the old evil."

In *The Winters Tale* Shakespeare "omitted all the irrelevancies that had clotted *Cymbeline* and presented the whole tragic pattern, from prosperity to destruction, regeneration, and still fairer prosperity, in full view of the audience." On the other hand, in *The Tempest* "Prospero is the agent of his own regeneration, the parent and tutor of Miranda; and through her and through his own works he changes the minds of his enemies. . . He began his action at a point in the story so late that the story was virtually over; and he included the total story either by narrating the past or by re-enacting samples of it; a complete reaction from the method of frontal attack used in *The Winter's Tale*." And again, "the theme of destruction, though exquisitely blended in the whole, is less vivid than it is in *The Winter's Tale*." Finally, "if you

cram a trilogy into a single play something has to be sacrificed. Shakespeare chose to make a different sacrifice in each of his two successful renderings of the complete tragic pattern: unity in *The Winter's Tale*, present rendering of the destructive part of the tragic pattern in *The Tempest*."

SONNETS OF SHAKESPEARE AND SOUTHAMPTON. By Walter Thompson; Blackwell; 12s. 6d.

Mr. Walter Thompson is the latest theoriser about the Sonnets of Shakespeare. He thinks they are by two different hands—those of Shakespeare, and his friend, the Earl of Southampton. Mr. Thompson will have nothing to do with Willie Hughes, the lovely boy actor whom Oscar Wilde imagined played the Shakespearian heroines on the stage, and perhaps the most valuable part of the book is the author's exposure of the fallacy that Shakespeare was the victim of a perverted sexual instinct.

But the Dark Lady is retained. She troubled the friendship between Shakespeare and his patron, estranging them for a time. Shakespeare in the 119th and 120th Sonnets treats the matter with dignity and Southampton replies with unwholesome passion in Sonnets 127 to 154. "The Lover's Complaint," Mr. Thompson thinks a light-hearted poem discovering for us the affectionate relations between Shakespeare and Southampton and the Sonnets should be interpreted in its light.

Mr. Thompson's theory that twenty-six of the Sonnets were written by Southampton seems utterly untenable. These are surely Shakespearian as the rest, and Mr. Thompson's attribution of them to another hand appears to us as wild as most of the other theorising based upon the assumption that Shakspeare of Stratford wrote the "Sugred Sonnets among his private friends." Who were Shakspeare's private friends? Presumably the deserving men players, Heminge, Condell, Phillips and the rest; Davenant who kept an inn at Oxford and the Quineys and Hurleys of Stratford. It seems improbable that the sonnets were circulated among these.

On the 20th May, 1609, in the register of the Stationer's company, the entry is of "A Booke called Shakespeares Sonnettes"—the form may be worth notice: the sonnets are not Shakespeare's: the book is called "Shakespeare's Sonnets" and the next reference also in 1609 when the sonnets were printed by G. Eld and published by Thomas Thorpe under the name of Shake-speare completes all the external evidence we have upon one of the most fascinating of literary problems.

STEVENSON'S BOOK OF SHAKESPEARE QUOTATIONS. Arranged and edited by Burton Stevenson. Cassell. 35s.

This volume of more than 1750 pages contains quotations from the Shakespeare plays and poems, the subjects being arranged in alphabetical order. Each quotation is separately numbered and can thus be easily traced. The more important subjects are divided into sections in order to bring cognate quotations together. What the Shakespearian characters—not necessarily Shakespeare—have to say on any subject can be found by turning to the subject and

reading through the quotations under it. One turns to the section "Beauty" for example and finds sub-sections headed "Its Power" and "Its Penalties" and "Its Use;" "Beauty in Women;" "Lack of Beauty" (see Ugliness). All closely related quotations are thus grouped which not only makes their comparison easy but provides most fascinating reading. The editor states he had been struck by the astonishing number of words and phrases which Shakespeare used only once—not only unusual and coined words, but ordinary ones. Vituperative passages especially consist of the former: in "The Tempest," I, I, three such words occur in a single line—"bawling," "blasphemous" and "uncharitable."

The evolution of various eccentricities of Shakespeare's diction is also traced: we find that the word "gobbets" for example occurs twice in the first play but never again, while "manacled" occurs twice in the last play but never in an earlier one. And this is true of phrases. "Turned to stone," drops out of use after "Henry VI," part 2, and "Swim like a Duck" is used for the first and only time in "Henry VIII."

There is also a most valuable concordance and glossary in which are indicated every unique phrase and word and here the editor has ploughed virgin soil: while he acknowledges his indebtedness to Onion's Shakespeare Glossary, it is obvious this is much the most comprehensive work of its kind. It will be invaluable to the student of Shakespeare, Bacon and Bacon-Shakespeare. We can only hope that a similar dictionary and concordance may be made of Francis Bacon's acknowledged works: a comparison would, of course, reveal to the fullest possible extent the identities of the thought and expression of Bacon and Shakespeare and might well be conclusive of the vexed question of "parallelisms."

SHAKESPEARE. MAN AND ARTIST. By Edgar I. Fripp (2 vols.). Oxford University Press. 38s.

These two volumes consist of nearly one thousand pages and constitute a study, the publishers announce, of Shakespeare the Man in the environment of his town and people and later in London. Their main interest is biographical and historical; aesthetic criticism of the plays was not the author's concern. Of the making of books about Shakespeare there is no end and this is yet another "imaginative reconstruction" of his life. It is not a biography in any sense of the word except that in which it is used by those afflicted with the mania for recreating Shakespeare out of the works ascribed to him. These volumes will be reviewed fully in the next issue of *BACONIANA*.

SHAKESPEARE'S HAMLET: THE FIRST QUARTO, 1603. Harvard University Press, 1931. Price \$3.00.

SHAKESPEARE'S HAMLET: THE SECOND QUARTO, 1604. Huntington Library, San Marino, California, 1938. Price \$3.50. The two volumes together, price \$5.00.

With the modern advance in textual criticism and the science of bibliography, it becomes increasingly necessary for scholars to possess reliable reprints of the rare original texts they may wish to study; and a collotype facsimile is the only means to this end.

The play of *Hamlet* presents one of the most important problems in Shakespearean textual scholarship; but the reprints hitherto available have not been faithful reproductions in the strictest sense, and most of them have long been out of print. In 1931 the Huntington Library published their facsimile of the 1603 quarto, and now comes a companion volume giving the 1604 quarto. This latter is furnished with a useful introduction by Prof. Oscar J. Campbell, of Columbia University.

The first quarto has commonly been regarded as "stolne and surreptitious," whether by piracy of a prompt book or by imperfect memory transcription by some actor, or by shorthand notes taken during a performance. The second quarto "newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true Coppie" was formerly regarded as a corrupt text; but the modern science of bibliography enables scholars to work out various interesting theories based on the different kinds of errors made by compositors, the methods of punctuation, the abnormalities of spelling, and so forth. By comparing these quartos with the text of the 1623 Folio inferences may be drawn as to date of writing, whether cut for stage purposes, whether one or more copyists had a hand in shaping the text, and similar problems. For all these purposes accurate facsimiles are indispensable, as may readily be imagined. Students will appreciate the value of these excellent volumes put forth by the enterprise of the Huntington Library, and we cordially recommend them to our readers.

ELIZABETH AND SIXTUS: a Seventeenth Century sidelight on the Spanish Armada. By H. Kendra Baker. London: the C.W. Daniel Company. Price 7s.6d. net.

To every student of the Elizabethan era, Elizabeth herself is one of the chief enigmas; and the completely differing opinions which have been held of her character, her abilities, her lovers, or her statesmanship, constitute in themselves a fascinating problem. It is probably not generally known that Pope Sixtus V was also a most extraordinary personality; and the intrigues between this well matched pair of diplomats forms a stirring chapter in the history of those times. Mr. Kendra Baker begins with a description of the three *dramatis personae* in his story, namely, "Elizabeth the Enigma, Leti the Lucifer, and Sixtus the Strategist," as he terms them; Leti being the brilliant Italian historian whose *Life of Elizabeth* deserves more attention than has hitherto been bestowed on it. The story of the plots and counter-plots at the time of the Spanish Armada is remarkably illuminating and interesting; while Leti's anecdotes, vividly told, of the eccentricities of that most unconventional of Popes, Sixtus V., are both informative and entertaining.

Mr. Kendra Baker presents the whole material in his customary bright and chatty style; so that, far from being a dull historical record, his book is attractive and well worth perusal either by the student or by the general reader. Our members will do well to procure this volume.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITORS OF BACONIANA.

Dear Sir,

Why Baconians should desire to connect Francis Bacon with Rosicrucianism passes all understanding. Study of the subject proves conclusively that, initiated in Germany centuries ago, the Societies were composed either of religious cranks or seekers after the Philosopher's Stone, who pretended to be able to transmute metals, to prolong life, and whose members were largely composed of charlatans who extracted money from the pockets of their victims in return for promises to cure them of their diseases.

Yet in the last issue of BACONIANA space is given to Mr. R. J. A. Bunnett, who endeavours to support the hypothesis that Bacon was a Rosicrucian by means of a series of suppositions that would do credit to the wildest Stratfordian. For example, Mr. Bunnett says "It would seem De Quincey was correct; it is *possible* that Bacon made the Rose Croix the 33rd degree of Masonry." Mr. Bunnett should first show that Bacon had anything at all to do with Masonry, other than by quoting writers whose work is the subject of ridicule.

Admitting that there is no direct evidence that Bacon was a Rosicrucian or even in touch with the Order, he says there are nevertheless factors which point to that conclusion. He says he (Bacon) *may well have met members of the Secret Brotherhood*. Using that type of assertion you can of course adduce anything you like, à la Sidney Lee and others relative to Shakspeare having possibly been a schoolmaster, a page, a lawyer's attorney, etc.

To say as he does, that the *Fama Fraternitatis* "has a distinct Baconian ring" is, I should say, about the worst compliment one could pay to Bacon's memory.

Then, because the *Fama* tells of some mythical youth who travelled to Arabia, Mr. Bunnett feels justified in asking "Have we not Francis Bacon here?" Was there ever a more preposterous suggestion? Later, Mr. Bunnett says, with an effrontery again worthy of the Stratfordians, that the thirty-seven reasons "of our purpose and intention," given in the *Fama* are "substantially Baconian," and of the *Chemical Marriage* he says "except for such a genius as Francis Bacon, this work, as a boyish effort, is incredible."

To me it seems to be still more incredible that anyone desirous to convert the uninitiated to a strange and entirely disadvantageous theory should imagine that he is likely to succeed by the employment of such arbitrary statements.

Yours faithfully,

W. A. VAUGHAN.

TO THE EDITORS OF BACONIANA.

Dear Sirs,—Referring to the article on Bacon and the Rosicrucians by Mr. Bunnett in your April number, there are further important pieces of evidence linking up Francis Bacon with the Rosi-

crucian Brotherhood, which I mentioned in a paper read by me at the Society's Rooms some years ago, and which up to that time had not, I believe, been noticed by previous writers. They were at any rate original as far as the present writer is concerned.

(1) The first point, which was published in *BACONIANA* about 40 years ago, drew attention to an English version of the *Advertisements from Parnassus* published in 1704, in which the well known Advertisement dealing with the *Universal Reformation* substituted Francis Bacon as General Secretary of the meeting of the seven sages of Greece, and Cato and Seneca of the Romans, instead of the Italian philosopher Jacopo Mazzoni. In this connection it may be observed that, in spite of Michael Maier's denial that the 77th Advertisement, now under consideration, had anything to do with the Rosicrucian manifestoes with which it was bound up in the first issue of 1614, it cannot be doubted that it really was intended to form a part of that little volume. Its object appears to have been to throw into sharp contrast the old learning typified by Aristotle and the new learning to be founded under the aegis of the Christian Brotherhood founded by the symbolical Christian Rosencreutz or Rosicross. This view is confirmed by the fact that the *Universal Reformation* was included with each new edition of the *Fama*.

(2) The second point is that Bishop Wilkins, a distinguished member and a founder of the Royal Society, in his book *Mathematical Magic*, otherwise an elementary book on Mechanics, first published in 1642, when speaking of the ever-burning lamps of the ancients stated to have been found in many of the ancient tombs, refers to the tomb of the Founder of the Fraternity in the following words (pages 236-7, edition 1680) 'Ludovicus Vives tells us of another lamp that did continue burning for 1050 years which was found a little before his time. Such a lamp is likewise related to be seen in the sepulchre of *Francis Rosicross*, as is more largely expressed in the confession of that Fraternity.' The above statement coming from Dr. John Wilkins, Bishop of Chester, Secretary, and one of the founders of the Royal Society, is not to be lightly regarded. It is, without a shadow of doubt, a highly important piece of evidence linking Francis Viscount St. Alban with the Fraternity of the Rosy Cross.

(3) The third point to be noted is taken from the writings of Francis St. Alban himself. It is to be found in the *New Atlantis*, where the entry of one of the Fathers into Bensalem is described. There is not space to quote the passage in full (page 29 in 4th edition bound up with the *Sylva Sylvarum*; the pagination is probably the same in all editions). The description of the Father might very well pass for Bacon himself as a young man. The whole page should be studied, but the particular passage to which attention is now invited is that containing the description of the chariot in which the Father was carried, and especially to the canopy covering it. The exact words are as follows: 'There was also a Sunn of gold, radiant upon the Topp in the midst; and on the Top before, a small *Cherub* of Gold tissued upon Blew.' The peculiar and erractic spelling has been retained. From this it will be seen that the emblem of the Father of the House was a radiant sun and a cherub (gold on blue). The reader is now referred to the engraved

frontispiece which was always bound up in the beginning of the *Sylva Sylvarum*, with which the *New Atlantis* was always bound up, but with a separate pagination. The first thing that strikes the eye is the sun in its glory darting down a radiant beam of light, whilst on either side of the sun is a cherub in the vault of heaven. This is peculiarly striking. Francis St. Alban identified himself with a Father of a secret House of Wisdom. Heydon identifies the *New Atlantis* with the land of the Rosicrucians. Bishop Wilkins calls the Founder of the Fraternity of the Rosy Cross *Francis Rosicross*. The unknown translator of the *Advertisement from Parnassus*, issued in 1704, identifies the Secretary of the *Universal Reformation* as Sir Francis Bacon.

(4) The concluding words of the *Fama* are a quotation from the Latin Old Testament, with a slight modification of one word, i.e., *Sub Umbra Alarum Tuarum Jehova*, (the last word *Jehova* being substituted for *Domine*); the meaning being "Beneath the shadow of thy Wings, Jehovah." This is a valedictory signature to the anonymous *Fama*. A reference to the above described engraved frontispiece of the *Sylva Sylvarum* will at once reveal the striking parallel between it and the valedictory signature; for on the radiant sun is inscribed in Hebrew characters the ineffable Name, Yod, He, Vau, He, transliterated in English *Jehovah*, supported to right and left by a winged cherub, whilst underneath is the Intellectual Globe. It is clearly a pictorial representation of the valedictory signature, constituting a veiled but readily perceptible acknowledgment of a Father of the Fraternity.

These four points offer strong testimony to the claims set out by many modern students that Francis St. Alban was most intimately associated with the Rosicrucian movement, and probably the prime mover. There are other equally strong testimonies of a different order, which it is not proposed to touch on here.

Yours faithfully,

L. BIDDULPH.

NOTES AND NOTICES.

The Council wish to call the especial attention of Members to the valuable additions made to our library at Canonbury Tower during the last month, and to the assistance for its re-arrangement, by the family of the late Mrs. Henry Pott, Founder of the Bacon Society.

The gifts so generously presented to us comprise a large terracotta reproduction of the seated figure of Francis Bacon in St. Michael's Church, Gorhambury; also the handsome book case on which the figure rests, containing many valuable books which were Mrs. Pott's particular favourites, and a copy of the well known death-mask of Shakespeare. All these are now placed in the library, and greatly add to its attraction.

In addition to these gifts, the family of Mrs. Pott have kindly contributed the funds for the shelving and fitting up of our new room as a store for the back numbers of *BACONIANA*, etc. This will be called the "Promus" room.

We wish also to record our hearty thanks to Miss Constance M. Pott, who has for many weeks given her time and energy to the re-arrangement of the books, a laborious work, most graciously and successfully accomplished. Mr. L. Biddulph also gave considerable assistance.

All these contributions are given by the family of Mrs. Henry Pott in affectionate memory of their mother, who had devoted her life to Baconian Problems.

In the course of an interesting article which appeared in a recent issue of the *Daily Mail* Michael Morris wrote of poets who have turned politician and political poets born and not made. The writer notices that there are many instances in England's history of poets who have wielded great influence other than that of their pens. First mentioned is Francis Bacon "who was Lord Chancellor of England and a great poet." Then there was John Milton the lovely youth who became the poet of his age, later Secretary to the Commonwealth and Cromwell's Foreign Secretary; his colleague Andrew Marvell the metaphysical poet who was Latin Secretary to the Council; Joseph Addison another poet who became an Under Secretary and Lord Byron who played so great a part in the cause of Greek Independence. James Elroy Flecker, Humbert Wolfe and W. B. Yeats are modern examples of poets in power.

Professor J. Dover Wilson, writing in *The Times Literary Supplement* of May 7th, observes that *Love's Labour's Lost* was "obviously written for a special and highly-educated audience." We quite agree. But as it requires a highly-educated author to write for "a special and highly-educated audience," the playwright must have belonged to the class for whom the play was specially written.

There is a fashion now prevailing to date *Love's Labour's Lost* much later than 1588-1589 as estimated by Dr. Furnivall. The earliest year now suggested is 1594. The reason is, no doubt, that William Shakspeare could have scarcely settled in London in 1588, and would still be struggling to shake off his native patois, and still waiting to be introduced by Lord Southampton into that society with which the play shows such familiarity. That the play was but a memory by 1598 is clear from an allusion to a performance about which Robert Tofte writes in reminiscent vein:

Love's Labour Lost, I *once* did see a Play

Y-cleped so.

This indicates a long interval of time. In fact, the play was not "y-cleped so" and he had evidently forgotten the correct title. The meeting of the King of France and Catherine de Medici in 1586 concerning the cession of Aquitaine for the sum of 200,000 crowns is referred to in Act II Sc. 1. This allusion would have lost all point and significance after a considerable interval. It would have to be topical to be appreciated by the "special" audience.

R. L. EAGLE.

The "vesture of humility" worn by "Coriolanus" in the recent production at the Old Vic, when soliciting the voices of the people for the office of Consul, was black. This was a mistake as the garment should be white. The Latin term for a competitor for a public office was "Candidatus" and was so called from the "toga candida"—the white toga—which he wore, according to custom, when showing himself to the people. Shakespeare knew this and alludes to it with more detail in *Titus Andronicus*:

Titus Andronicus, the people of Rome,
Whose friend in justice thou hast ever been,
Send thee by me, their tribune and their trust,
This palliament of white and spotless hue,
And name thee in election for the empire,
With these our late-deceased emperor's sons.
Be *candidatus* then, and put it on.

R. L. EAGLE.

"The Admirable Crichton" is one of the mystery figures of the period. He was born in 1560. Nothing is known of his life until at the age of ten he entered St. Salvator's College of St. Andrew's University. At 17 years of age, he is said to have been able to converse in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldaic, Italian, Spanish, French, Flemish, German, Scottish, and English. In 1577 he is said to have challenged the leading scholars in Paris to debate with him on any subject and in any language they might choose. He left France in 1579 for Italy and is reported to have criticised the instructors at Padua for their teaching of Aristotle. It was stated on somewhat doubtful authority that he was assassinated at Mantua in 1583.

There are coincidences here with Bacon's early life—the date of birth, the years during which he visited France and the existence of such another phenomenon who was apparently unknown to Bacon and his contemporaries. Crichton, according to The Dictionary of National Biography, was a famous swordsman. That

accomplishment is not open to the same doubt as the legends of his intellectual achievements and if young Francis Bacon disputed with the pillars of learning in France and Italy, he may have done so under the name of James Crichton who was abroad at that time.

R. L. EAGLE.

The Stanford University Press, California, announces its intention to publish in two folio volumes facsimiles of all the major documents concerning Shakespeare together with transliteration, translation and a commentary by Professor B. R. Lewis who is Professor of English and Director of the Shakespeare Laboratory in the University of Utah.

This is another important contribution from the U.S.A. to Shakespearian research and the task of students of the text, future biographers and historians should be greatly facilitated.

The documents to be reproduced range from early Stratford records of the Shakspere family to late seventeenth century manuscripts.

An interesting correspondence has recently been carried on in the "*Times*" *Literary Supplement* with regard to the problem of the sonnets. Lord Alfred Douglas, author of "*The True History of Shakespeare's Sonnets*" which was published in 1933 has been defending the theory that the enigmatical Mr. W. H. was Will Hughes (or Hews). He will not have the theory that the sonnets were addressed to Southampton, but refers to this as so obviously absurd that he cannot patiently discuss it and to a great extent he is entitled to sympathy, although not for the reasons perhaps that Baconians would offer him. It has always seemed incredible that as early as 1590 Shakspere of Stratford should have been entreating the young Earl of Southampton to marry. There are so many things about the Sonnets which seem quite irreconcilable with the authorship by an actor of humble origin. Why should he complain of being "in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes" when Shakespeare is supposed to have been so successful that he was able to retire after ten years' work in London. Similarly the poet complains of being "barred of public honours;" that his name had received a "brand" because he had to earn his living by public means. He mentions that he had on one occasion borne the "canopy," which must mean the Queen's, in a procession and thought nothing of that; and he alludes to a threat of assassination which we know Bacon feared at one time, but of which there is no evidence that Shakspere was ever in danger.

However we must leave Shakespearians to settle their difficulties in their own way.

It is naturally the desire of all Baconians that our problems may one day be solved by the discovery of authentic documents, such as manuscripts of some of the Shakespeare plays; and Mr. A. E. Loosley believe he has lighted on clues which may lead to that end. We have not space to describe his methods in detail, but may say that his former co-worker, the late William Safford, noted several passages, one for example in Bacon's *Novum Organum* and another in No. 111 of the Shakespeare Sonnets, which appeared to him to contain secret allusions to a locality where original MSS. may lie hidden. Naturally such indications would not be very definite, or they might have been prematurely discovered; and therefore the

sceptic will doubtless say they are imaginary. Yet without imagination even the scientist would be severely handicapped in formulating hypotheses.

At all events, Mr. Loosley has thought it worth while to test the theories elaborated by Mr. Safford, and for this purpose he has for several years past been excavating the ground on the spot apparently indicated. This piece of ground is in the form of a large letter E; and after making a series of measurements Mr. Loosley is convinced that the position of the ground corresponds with the hints in the above mentioned books. Nearly 30 ft. below the surface he discovered a number of shaped stones each about 2½ ft. square, and on one of them a sign denoting "entrance." He has also found underground chambers and tunnels at this spot; so that clearly there are remains of some kind of building made by man; and further investigation should reveal whether or not this is of the nature expected. The results already obtained give Mr. Loosley hopes that he is on the right track, and he is persevering steadily. We cannot express a definite opinion on the value of these researches, but wish him good fortune in his task. Should his efforts eventually be crowned with success, he will have earned not only fame but the gratitude of all seekers after truth.

BACON v. SHAKESPEARE.

SHAKSPER.

To gain command of English words and every grammar rule,
 'Tis best to be a butcher's son and never go to school.
 To form good plays in perfect style, and full of classic knowledge,
 'Tis best to be a poacher bold, and never go to college.
 To write of ladies, lords and dukes, of kings and kingly sport,
 'Tis best to be a common man and never go to court.
 To write about philosophy and law and medicine,
 'Tis best to stand at horses' heads, and never read a line.
 To treat of foreign lands in strains that all men must applaud,
 'Tis best to stay in England and never go abroad.
 To scale the heights of human bliss and sound the depths of woe,
 'Tis best to make a steady "pile" and never let it go.
 If come to ripe maturity when genius has full play,
 'Tis best to lead an easy life and lay the pen away.
 To show that "knowledge is the wing wherewith we fly to Heaven,"
 'Tis best that to your own dear child no lessons should be given.
 To surely earn immortal fame as England's greatest bard,
 'Tis best to leave no manuscripts and die of "drinking hard."

BACON.

To win injustice and contempt from every biassed mind,
 'Tis best to be "the wisest and the brightest of mankind."

L'Envoi Sereieux.

SHAKE-SPEARE.

To warn the strong, to teach the proud, to give new knowledge scope,
 'Twas best to use a nom-de-plume, and write in faith and hope
 That future ages, wiser grown, would learn the royal rule,
 That knowledge does not come to those who never go to school.